



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

**COPY MAILED**

**JUN 23 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Chin-Ying Huang :  
Application No. 10/788,751 :  
Filed: February 27, 2004 :  
Attorney Docket No. 12929.1104USC2 :

DECISION ON PETITION  
UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed February 23, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional application set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant petition does not comply with item (1) above.

The concurrently filed amendment to add the prior-filed application on page one following the first sentence of the specification is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed application. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both

applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) can be granted, a substitute amendment<sup>1</sup> deleting the incorporation by reference statement for application number 09/755,316 along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                     Customer Service Window  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                        (703) 872-9306  
                                    ATTN: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Irvin Dingle at (571) 272-3210.

  
Frances Hicks

Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

---

<sup>1</sup> Note 37 CFR 1.121